court shall have full power to hear and determine any objections which may be filed against such sale by any person interested in the property and may confirm or set aside said sale.

Wilson v. Watts, 9 Md. 356. Gayle v Fattle, 14 Md. 69. White v. Malcolm, 15 Md 541. Hubbard v. Jarrell, 23 Md 66. Black v. Carroll, 24 Md. 252 Cockey v. Cole, 28 Md 283 Warfield v. Ross, 38 Md. 85. Horsey v. Hough, 38 Md. 130. Warfield v. Dorsey, 39 Md. 299. Warehime v. Carroll Co. Build. Ass'n, 44 Md. 512. Bank of Commerce v. Lanahan, 45 Md. 396. Carroll v. Kershner, 47 Md. 262. Lamm v. Port Deposit Ass'n, 49 Md. 233. Frostburg Mutual Build. Ass'n v. Lowdermilk, 50 Md 179. Mahoney v. Mackubin, 52 Md. 357. Webb v. Haeffer, 53 Md. 190. Patapsco Guano Co. v. Elder, 53 Md. 464 Dirks v. Humbird, 54 Md. 399. Loeber v. Eckes, 55 Md. 1. Wicks v. Westcott, 59 Md. 270. White v. McClellan, 62 Md. 347. Dickerson v. Small, 64 Md. 395. Chilton v. Brooks, 69 Md. 587. Bernstein v. Hobelman, 70 Md. 29. Schaeffer v. Bond, 70 Md. 480. Chilton v Brooks. 71 Md. 445. Condon v. Maynard, 71 Md. 601. Roberts v. Loyola Ass'n, 74 Haskey v. James, 75 Md. 568. Albert v Hamilton, 76 Md 307. Hanover Ins Co. v. Brown, 77 Md. 71. West Md. etc. Co. v. Goodwin, 77 Md 271. Heider v. Bladen, 83 Md. 243. Hughes v. Riggs, 84 Md. 502. Richardson v. Owings, 86 Md. 693. Carroll v. Hutton, 88 Md. 676. Carroll v Hutton, 91 Md. 379. Bentley v. Beacham, 91 Md. 678. Aukam v. Zantzinger, 94 Md. 426.

1888, art. 66, sec. 10. 1860, art. 64, sec. 9. 1826, ch. 192, sec. 5.

10. If such sale be set aside by the court, a re-sale may be ordered to be made by the party who made the previous sale, or the court may, if justice requires it, appoint a trustee to sell the same.

Reeside v. Peter, 35 Md. 220. Basshor v. Stewart, 54 Md. 380. Dircks v. Logsdon, 59 Md. 177. Chilton v. Brooks, 69 Md. 587.

Ibid. sec. 11. 1860, art. 64, sec. 10. 1826, ch. 192, sec. 4 1836, ch. 249, sec. 7.

11. All such sales, when confirmed by the court and the purchase money is paid, shall pass all the title which the mortgagor had in the said mortgaged premises at the time of the recording of the mortgage.

Warfield v. Ross, 38 Md. 85 Leonard v. Groome, 47 Md. 504. Direks v. Logsdon, 59 Md. 177. Duval v. Becker, 81 Md. 549.

Ibid. sec. 12. 1860, art. 64, sec. 11. 1826, ch. 192, sec. 5. 1836, ch. 249, sec. 8.

12. Upon a sale of such mortgaged premises, any person claiming an interest in the equity of redemption may apply to the court confirming the sale to have the surplus of the pro-